

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE

Feedback to Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2006-2007 Annual Reports

DEPARTMENT English DATE November 2007

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Joan Hawthorne, Jon Jackson

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

In addition to the Departmental goals, please also consider UND's Institutional and General Education goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses). For each goal, use a Y (yes), N (no), or ? (qualified y/n or uncertain) to indicate whether this department has a similar or related goal.

- X 1 Communication ("communicate effectively, both orally and in writing")
- 2 Critical/creative thinking ("think critically and creatively" and "be intellectually curious and creative")
- 3 Informed choices ("make informed choices")
- 4 Understanding across disciplines ("understand how conclusions are reached in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the arts and sciences" and "acquire knowledge over a broad spectrum of subject areas")
- 5 Lifelong learning ("commit themselves to lifelong learning")
- 6 Cross-cultural appreciation ("develop some familiarity with cultures other than their own")
- X 7 Service/citizenship ("commit themselves to...the service of others," and "share responsibility both for their communities and for the world")

Comments regarding Departmental goals and alignment of Departmental Goals with Institutional and General Education Goals:

Undergraduate: Although the narrative in the annual report suggests that meaningful goals for student learning are not amenable to assessment, in fact it appears that the department does continue to work on assessment – although they might be encouraged to add goals about perspicacity of observation, intellectual inventiveness, depth of research, etc. If these are qualities being nurtured within the major, it seems likely that faculty are finding ways to value these traits in grading and they could also be addressed through creative assessments (which need not be standardized or reductive, if done thoughtfully through faculty-created methods).

Graduate: The list of goals for graduate student learning is much more detailed and nuanced than for undergraduates.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- Were any specific assessment methods referenced? YES X NO QUALIFIED Y/N
- If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? YES X NO QUALIFIED Y/N
 - Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a "multiple measures" approach? YES X NO QUALIFIED Y/N

Comments:

Undergraduate: Data have been collected through narratives collected from faculty based on readings of student work, from surveys, and from focus groups.

Graduate: Thesis and dissertation directors are submitting data to the Grad Director.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__

In addition to departmental goals, some assessment results may be applicable to Institutional and General Education goals. A list of the latter goals is included below. Please indicate with a Y, N, or ? whether results reported are applicable to Institutional or General Education goal achievement. For items with a Y or a ?, please describe findings in the appropriate section below.

- ____X__ 1 Communication (“communicate effectively, both orally and in writing”)
____ 2 Critical/creative thinking (“think critically and creatively” and “be intellectually curious and creative”)
____ 3 Informed choices (“make informed choices”)
____ 4 Understanding across disciplines (“understand how conclusions are reached in the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the arts and sciences” and “acquire knowledge over a broad spectrum of subject areas”)
____ 5 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
____ 6 Cross-cultural appreciation (“develop some familiarity with cultures other than their own”)
____ 7 Service/citizenship (“commit themselves to...the service of others,” and “share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding results and the application of results to Departmental, Institutional and General Education Goals:

Faculty note that senior level students enter their classes with writing and research skills below the level expected of seniors.

Undergraduate: Based on an evaluation of student work, faculty in senior level courses were dissatisfied with the level of intellectual preparation. However, the data don’t appear to be directly linked to the goals, and it would be useful for faculty to include explicit attention to analysis of learning in relation to departmental goals (in addition to general commentary) when writing their direct assessment narratives.

Graduate: Learning was reported in direct relation to learning goals within the grad program, and areas for improvement (also in relation to goals) were identified.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

Undergraduate: Curricular changes have been made as a result of data. Changes are not always tied to learning goals, but are designed to improve both student learning and the undergraduate experience of majors.

Graduate: The report does not clearly indicate whether specific actions related to learning goals have been taken on the basis of data collected to date.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☒ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☒ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The report hints at some dissatisfaction with goals for undergraduate student learning, which would be a reason for reopening discussion of them to consider adding higher level goals that may better correspond with the department's own aspirations. Grad goals are much more clearly delineated and data collected within the grad program are clearly tied to specific goals – which is exactly what we hope to see in an assessment report (this is not to discourage collection of additional data, but those engaged in data collection would normally be expected to look first and most deeply at data speaking directly to departmental learning goals).

Reviewer(s):	Name	Joan Hawthorne__	Jon Jackson__
	Department	Provost's Office__	Anatomy and Cell Biology__
	Phone Number	777-4684__	777-2101__
	e-mail	joan_hawthorne@und.nodak.edu__	jackson@medicine.nodak.edu__

Section 1: __Y__ Section 2: __Y__ Section 3: __?__ Section 4: __Y__

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available
- ? = action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done